

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated January 8, 2008, the Examiner rejects claims 6 through 12 and 15 through 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant notes the Examiner's Response to Arguments section and respectfully traverses. For the sole purpose of advancing prosecution of the present application, Applicant presents herein the amended claims.

Claims 6 through 12 and 15 through 27 are currently pending in the present application, with claims 6, 15, 22 and 27 being independent claims. By way of the present Response, Applicant hereby amends independent claims 6, 15, 22 and 27. No new matter has been added and the amendments are supported by the specification as originally filed. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant submits that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 through 12 and 15 through 27.

The Examiner rejects claims 6 through 12 and 15 through 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Specifically the Examiner asserts that the term "high" in independent claims 6, 15, 22 and 27, is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite as it is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not reasonably be apprised of the scope of the

invention. In view of Applicant's amendments to independent claims 6, 15, 22 and 27, wherein reference to the term "high" has been removed, the Examiner's rejection is moot.


The Examiner further notes in his Response to Arguments, however, that the term "low", which still appears in the independent claims as currently amended, is a relative term that is not explicitly or implicitly defined by the claims or the specifications and would not be readily understood by one of ordinary skill in the relevant art. The Applicant respectfully disagrees, as Applicant explained in the previous response to Office Action, dated 7/9/2007, the specification offers descriptions to properly and adequately support the distinction of the claimed "low" weight. On the basis of the recited elements claimed herein and the specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to adequately and proper determine what constitutes "index entries having a low weight." In order to advance prosecution of this application, however, Applicant hereby amends the independent claims to recite that "the low weight corresponds to the weight of the index entry having the lowest weight of the portion of the index searched". In light of the claim amendments to the independent claims, Applicant submits that claims 6, 15, 22 and 27 and the corresponding dependent claims are definite. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6 through 12 and 15 through 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and allowance of the same.

For at least all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and objections, and allowance of all the pending claims is respectfully solicited. To expedite prosecution of this application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the Applicants' undersigned representative to discuss any issues relating to this application.

Dated: March 20, 2008

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING  
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY  
THROUGH THE PATENT AND  
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING  
SYSTEM ON March 20, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeanpierre Giuliano  
Reg. No. 55,206  
DREIER LLP  
499 Park Ave.  
New York, New York 10022  
Tel : (212) 328-6000  
Fax: (212) 600-9499  
*Customer No. 61834*